

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 7-10, 18-25 and 42-49 are pending in the present application. Claims 7, 18, 21 and 42 are the independent claims.

Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 7, 18, 21 and 42 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added. Proper support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification at least at paragraph [0034].

II. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER JP 07295998 (HEREINAFTER TOYAMA) IN VIEW U.S. PATENT NO. 6,091,930 (HEREINAFTER MORTIMER)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 7, as amended, recites, amongst other novel aspects, a method of updating commodity catalog information recorded on a medium, comprising, accessing a server corresponding to the commodity catalog information written on the medium through a computer network, after user registration.

Toyama discloses a disk drive that reads commodity information from an electronic publication medium storing catalog information and writes revision data of the commodity information and history information to a magneto-optical disk. However, Toyama neither teaches nor suggests, accessing a server corresponding to the commodity catalog information written on the medium through a computer network, **after user registration**, as recited in newly amended independent claim 7.

Mortimer suggests an educational system in which a CITbook is modified by a professor for use in a particular class. If the professor makes any changes to the existing CITbook, any additions or deletions to the CITbook are marked so that the student can determine what portions are well accepted as opposed to those portions which are not well accepted. Further, once distributed, the additions or deletions can be reviewed and any markings removed if it is determined that the changes correspond to well accepted information. In this way, the subject matter is kept up to date while

allowing the students to distinguish well-accepted text versus non-well accepted text. (Col. 6, lines 47-67, col. 7, lines 1-13, line 51 to col. 8, line 5 of Mortimer) Accordingly, Mortimer also fails to teach or suggest accessing a server corresponding to the commodity catalog information written on the medium through a computer network, **after user registration**, as recited in newly amended independent claim 7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Toyama nor Mortimer, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 7, as amended.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 8-10 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 7, and the reasons set forth above.

III. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15, 18 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TOYAMA IN VIEW OF EP 0817181 A2 (HEREINAFTER TOGNAZZINI)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Therefore, the rejection of claim 15 is moot.

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites, amongst other novel aspects, accessing a server corresponding to existing commodity catalog information read from the medium, **after user registration**.

As noted above, Toyama fails to teach or suggest accessing a server corresponding to existing commodity catalog information read from the medium, **after user registration**.

By way of review, Tognazzini discloses a hybrid disk 100 having a read only area 101 and a read/write area 102. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Tognazzini also fails to teach or suggest accessing a server corresponding to existing commodity catalog information read from the medium after user registration, as recited in newly amended independent claim 18.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 18 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Toyama nor Tognazzini, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 18, as newly amended.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claim 22 is allowable at least because of its dependence from claim 18, and the reasons set forth above.

IV. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 19-20 AND 23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TOYAMA IN VIEW OF TOGNAZZINI AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF U.S. PATENT 5,937,158 (HEREINAFTER URANAKA)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 19-20 and 23 depend from independent claim 18 and as noted above, neither Toyama nor Tognazzini, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 18, as amended.

Uranaka discloses a system and a method for providing services to connect portable media with a network (column 1, lines 8-10). Uranaka fails to teach or suggest accessing a server corresponding to existing commodity catalog information read from the medium, **after user registration**, as recited in newly amended independent claim 18.

Accordingly, neither Toyama, nor Tognazzini, nor Uranaka, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 18, as newly amended.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 19-20 and 23 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 18, and the reasons set forth above.

V. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 21 AND 24-25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TOYAMA IN VIEW OF URANAKA AND MORTIMER

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 21, as amended, recites, amongst other novel aspects, accessing a server corresponding to existing commodity catalog information read from the medium after user registration.

As noted above, neither Toyama nor Uranaka nor Mortimer, whether taken singly

or combined teach or suggest accessing a server corresponding to existing commodity catalog information read from the medium, **after user registration**, as recited in independent claim 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 24-25 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 21, and the reasons set forth above.

VI. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 42-49 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER TOYAMA IN VIEW OF U.S. PATENT 5,953,309 (HEREINAFTER YOSHIMOTO)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 42, as amended, recites, amongst other novel aspects, a writeable area in which updated commodity catalog information is written when provided by the server after user registration.

Toyama discloses a disk drive that reads commodity information from an electronic publication medium storing catalog information and writes revision data of the commodity information and history information to a magneto-optical disk. However, Toyama neither teaches nor suggests, a writeable area in which updated commodity catalog information is written when provided by the server, **after user registration**, as recited in newly amended independent claim 42.

Yoshimoto discloses an optical disk having recording regions divided into zones, each zone including physical tracks adjacent to each other (abstract). Therefore, Yoshimoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Toyama.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Toyama nor Yoshimoto, whether taken singly or combined teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 42, as amended.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 43-49 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 42, and the reasons set forth

above.

VII. CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

At a minimum, the Board should enter this Amendment at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 6/27/05

By: Douglas X. Rodriguez
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510